

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed 08 June 2007, the Examiner indicated that it is unclear why US 4,972,105 was submitted with our last response. The Examiner reviewed claims 1-17. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e); has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); and has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 1-17 remain pending.

Question Regarding Submission of US 4,972,105

The Examiner has indicated that it is unclear why applicants submitted US 4,972,105 with the last response.

As described on page 3 of the Office Action Response filed 26 January 2007, for the purpose of background Applicant enclosed a copy of US 4,972,105.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. (US 2003/0184339). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

As detailed below, Applicant submits that Ikeda does not expressly or inherently disclose the “initialization function” as recited in claim 1.

The integrated circuit of claim 1 includes “memory... storing instructions for an initialization function used to transfer the configuration data to the programmable configuration points within the configurable logic array in response to an initialization event.” The “initialization function” enables on-chip resources to configure the configurable logic array in the event of a reset or other initialization event that can occur for example during transfer of the configuration data. See Application as filed paragraph [0034].

In making the rejection the Examiner does not associate an element of Ikeda with the “initialization function” of claim 1. In a review of Ikeda, Applicant does not find any discussion of an initialization function as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant submits that it is not necessary that Ikeda store instructions for an initialization function.

Ikeda relates to an “integrated circuit device that has a high processing speed” (See Ikeda, paragraph [0008]). Ikeda discloses defining the functions of an integrated circuit by changing the connections within a matrix of “operation units” suited for special purpose processing (See Ikeda, paragraph [0005]). The connections within the matrix can be changed by an execution program stored in memory. However, Ikeda does not address programming the matrix in the event of an initialization event during the configuration of the matrix.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that an “initialization function” as recited in claim 1 is not necessary for Ikeda’s stated purpose of “a compact, economical integrated circuit device that has high processing speed and favorable AC characteristics.” See Ikeda, paragraph [0007]. Therefore, an “initialization function” is not necessarily present. Furthermore, if such an “initialization function” were intended by Ikeda one would expect some discussion of how to configure the matrix in the event of an initialization event. Applicant does not find any such discussion.

Therefore, since Ikeda does not disclose expressly or inherently disclose the “initialization function” as recited in claim 1, Ikeda does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 12, 15, and 17 depend from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 12, 15 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Hsu et al. (US 5,359,570).

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and Applicant submits that the prima facie case as to claim 4 is incomplete for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and because of the unique combinations recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Sun et al. (US 6,401,221).

Claims 8-9 depend from claim 1, and Applicant submits that the prima facie case as to claims 8-9 are incomplete for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and because of the unique combinations recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Sun et al. (US 5,901,330), hereinafter referred to as “Sun2”.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and Applicant submits that the prima facie case as to claim 10 is incomplete for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and because of the unique combinations recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 10 as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Lawman (US 6,028,445).

Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and Applicant submits that the prima facie case as to claim 11 is incomplete for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and because of the unique combinations recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 as amended is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of Akao et al. (US 5,900,008).

Claim 16 depends from claim 1, and Applicant submits that the prima facie case as to claim 16 is incomplete for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, and because of the unique combinations recited.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 16 as amended is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee determined to be due in connection with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0869 (MXIC 1521-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 07 December 2007

/Jonathan Putnam/

Jonathan M. Putnam, Reg. No. 60,102

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax